DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 454 UD 014 182

TITLE	An Evaluation of the High School Redirection Program. State Urban Education Program.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	70p.; Function No. 17-36455
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Attendance Records; Dropout Identification; *Dropout Prevention; Dropout Programs; High Schools; High School Students; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Instruction; Summer Programs; *Urban Schools; Vocational Education; Work Experience Programs; *Work Study Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

The High School Redirection Program was designed to maintain 240 potential dropouts in an educational-vocational setting while assisting them to progress toward a high school diploma. Students were admitted from 13 high schools in Brooklyn and from Andrew Jackson in Queens. They were to follow a work-study program through the summer and regular academic year combining selected classes for academic credit and paid work experience in alternate weeks. After five months of intensive research, the following findings required by the Evaluation Design were reported: (1) it is apparent that the overall program objective seeking to redirect dropouts and potential dropouts toward meaningful educational and vocational goals is being achieved; (2) academic achievement goals measured by the successful completion of courses as established in the original proposal are being met; (3) attendance achievement goals established in the original proposal are being met; (4) specific remedial reading and mathematics goals determined by standardized tests as established in the original proposal are bing met; (5) academic achievement goals measured by teacher-made tests as established in the original proposal are being met; and, (6) vocational (work experience) goals established in the original proposal are being met. (Author/JM)

ED 091454

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Function No. 17-36455

AN EVALUATION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL REDIRECTION PROGRAM

STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded by the New York State Urban Education program enacted at the 1970 Legislative Session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty." (Education Law 3602, subdivision II as amended.) Performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1972-1973 school year.

Project Evaluation Team:
Professor Carl P. Schmidt, Director
Professor Bennett Roth, Consultant
Ethel Gilman
Karen Dudsak
Linda Indelicato

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

July, 1973

UD 013 [illegible]

New York University

School of Education
Center for Educational Research and Field Services

51 Press Building
Washington Square
New York, N.Y. 10003
Telephone: (212) 598-2898, 3425

July 15, 1973

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni
Acting Director
Bureau of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Polemeni:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated June 11, 1973 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Educational Research and Field Services, I am pleased to submit three hundred copies of the final report, An Evaluation of the High School Redirection Program.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under State Urban Education, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Spinner

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
Executive Summary		i
I.	Program Description	1
II.	Program and Evaluation Objectives	1
III.	Evaluation Paradigm	7
IV.	Student Achievement Data	8
	A. Code for Terminations	8
	B. Reading Scores	9
	C. Social Studies Scores	10
	D. Math Scores	11
	E. Science Scores	12
	F. English Scores	12
	G. Percentage of Courses Passed	14
	H. Attendance	15
	I. Work Experience	16
	J. Summary of Findings and Recommendations on Student Achievement Data	17
V.	Interviews and Observations	19
	A. Counselling Staff	20
	B. Teaching Staff	23
	C. Administrative	26
	D. Student Interviews and Student Questionnaires	28
	E. Findings	35
VI.	Appendices	39
	A Appendix I	40
	Non-Referenced Standardized Test Results	41
	B Appendix II	42
	Student Questionnaire–Interview Form	43
	C Appendix III	46
	Teacher-Made Test	
	1. Biology	47
	2. English	50
	D Appendix IV	55
	Teaching Materials	
	1. Remedial Reading	56
	2. English	58
	3. Social Studies	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Code for Terminations	8
II	Pre, Predicted Post and Actual Post Program Scores in Reading for Participants in High School Redirection Program	9
III	Comparison Between Reading Growth Per Month in Sending School and High School Redirection Program for Participants in the High School Redirection Program	10
IV	Pre and Post Program Scores in Social Studies as Measured by the Board of Education's City-Wide Social Studies Examination	10
V	Pre, Predicted Post and Achieved Post Program Scores in Math as Measured by the California Achievement Test	11
VI	Pre and Post Scores in Science for High School Redirection Program Participants as Measured by a Teacher-Made Test	12
VII	Pre and Post Scores in English as Measured by the Board of Education's City-Wide English Examination	12
VIII	Pre and Post Program Scores in English as Measured by a Teacher-Made Test	13
IX	A Comparison of Percentage of Courses Passed between Sending School and High School Redirection Program for Participants in the High School Redirection Program for the Academic Year 1972-1973	14
X	Percentage of Courses Passed for Participants in the High School Redirection Program, Summer 1972	14
XI	A Comparison between Sending School Attendance and High School Redirection Attendance for Participants in the High School Redirection Program 1972-1973 Academic Year	15
XII	Percentage of Days Present for Participants in the High School Redirection Program, Summer 1972	16
XIII	Work Experience Grades for Students in the High School Redirection Program	17
XIV	Summary of Student Responses to Questionnaire	30
XV	Random Sample of Thirty Students' Records in Reading	37
XVI	Stratified Random Sample of Reading Scores by Grade Level	37

PREFACE

This evaluation is the result of the combined efforts of a variety of people. A carefully selected New York University team was established in February of 1973 to conduct and analyze numerous interviews and observations, to compute and analyze scores, to develop and disseminate instruments, and to examine results and evolve recommendations. As there were only five months to retrieve, analyze and report data, the assessment, though precise in its domain, must remain somewhat tentative. Nonetheless, the seriousness of purpose which characterized the team's efforts should make this a valuable guide for future planning.

As Director, I would be remise to neglect mentioning others, the research assistants and secretary among them.

Additionally, I wish to express my gratitude to the administration, staff and students of the High School Redirection Program. Obviously, without their assistance and patience, this report would not have been possible.

Carl P. Schmidt
July, 1973

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The High School Redirection Program was designed to maintain 240 potential dropouts in an educational-vocational setting while assisting them to progress toward a high school diploma. Students were admitted from thirteen high schools in Brooklyn and from Andrew Jackson in Queens. They were to follow a work-study program through the summer and regular academic year combining selected classes for academic credit and paid work experience in alternate weeks. In keeping with the basic design, emphasis was to be placed on "redirecting the 240 potential dropouts and assisting them in developing an educational-vocational plan to continue full-time until graduation or to enter the labor market at the highest possible level."

The original design called for evaluation throughout the course of the program. Because the Board of Education resolution approving the Evaluation Design did not occur until late in January of 1973, the evaluation procedures could not be implemented until February, 1973.

The 1972-1973 evaluation followed objectives written in the proposal. The methods of data retrieval and data analysis identified therein were employed in every case except for tardiness for which records had not been kept and for some students in the program whose individual records were not available from the sending schools. Obviously, the late date of approving the evaluation plan both complicated the retrieval and analysis processes and diminished the ongoing effectiveness of the evaluation as a means of generating significant change in the program operation during this year. In addition to the evaluation processes identified in the basic design, observations; interviews with staff, faculty and students; questionnaires; and the examination of unit and lesson plans and teacher-made tests were developed and/or conducted by the evaluation team. More than thirty visits to the site were made by evaluation team members from March 1 through June 15. Additionally, many evaluation team meetings were held in our efforts to engage in item analysis between and among the discreet categories of evaluation suggested by the basic design or added by the Evaluation Team.

FINDINGS

After five months of intensive research, the following findings required by the Evaluation Design can be reported:

1. It is apparent that the overall program objective seeking to redirect dropouts and potential dropouts toward meaningful educational and vocational goals is being achieved.
2. Academic achievement goals measured by the successful completion of courses as established in the original proposal are being met.
3. Attendance achievement goals established in the original proposal are being met.
4. Specific remedial reading and mathematics goals determined by standardized tests as established in the original proposal are being met.
5. Academic achievement goals measured by teacher-made tests as established in the original proposal are being met.
6. Vocational (work experience) goals established in the original proposal are being met.

Additional findings suggested by the Evaluation Design or developed by the Evaluation Team include the following:

7. Student responses in interviews and on questionnaires provided ready approval of the "openness" of the program. Most preferred High School Redirection Program to their previous schools citing "informality," "the improved availability of teachers," the "smaller class size" and the counselling program as important factors in their preference. Predictably, preferences for subjects and teachers were indicated on the basis of teacher's interest in the student rather than the content of the course.
8. The most experienced administrative personnel in the program were frequently occupied with funding problems or problems generated by the structural relation-

ship of the program to a variety of city and state offices.

9. Both the funding crises mentioned above and the inexperience of teachers and counsellors discussed below forced supervisors to function as counsellors or teachers, inhibiting adequate supervisory services.

10. The lack of job security for staff members in the program and the special requirements for successful performance within the program made appropriate recruitment impossible. Turnover among teachers and counsellors has been virtually complete in each of the last two years of the program's operation.

11. Given the general inexperience of staff in the program, supervisory personnel have not provided appropriate guidelines to operationalize the larger goals, purposes and objectives of the program.

12. For reasons cited above, administrative decisions are perceived by the staff as being made without staff consultation.

13. Systematic methods or forms for the appropriate storage and retrieval of information required for the free flow of information within the staff and between the staff and students have not been developed.

14. Neither teachers nor counsellors are initially prepared by formal training or previous experience to cope with the learning and adjustment difficulties of the student population.

15. Because of the experimental nature of this program, the majority of teachers and counsellors have either no conceptual model appropriate to their respective roles or models vitiated by or conflicting with others' within the program.

16. There is no provision for lead-time or inservice training of teachers or counsellors, despite repeated requests for same according to the project director.

17. The absence of academic criteria for entrance to the program was noted. This

resulted in a student population with a variety of learning disabilities which were seldom considered in the preparation or presentation of academic course content with the exception of work in remedial reading.

18. The special needs of the English as a second language learner are generally neglected in the academic and counselling functions of the program. There are no special ESL courses in curriculum areas such as social studies, math, etc. Because of scores received on reading tests, however, students were placed in special reading groups.

INTERPRETATION

While the program objectives defined in the Evaluation Design were met as indicated by the data in the report below, it was far more difficult for the Evaluation Team to identify the causes for success beyond the "second and perhaps last chance" nature of the program. Data gathered from staff and student interviews, class observations, reviews of teaching materials, unit plans, lesson plans and from observation of staff functions pointed to problems which might well be missed in a ready acceptance of the findings identified in items one to six or of the students' generally favorable endorsement of the program.

Fifty-eight students were terminated or dropped out during the academic year for causes other than those consistent with the program's objectives. The standard deviation figures on tests pointed to con ifferences in achievement even among those students who completed the program. Briefly, this data and careful analysis of the reading scores and attendance data indicated that while the program was working very well for the majority of the student population, about one-fourth of the students accepted either were terminated or did not meet the academic objectives set for the program or simply removed themselves from the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In a program so beset with both economic and functional difficulties, the most significant finding may well be the success of the program for the majority of the students. It

seems apparent that for this student population, the advantages gained from exposure to an educational-vocational environment in which they believe they both belong and have a vested interest far outweigh the operational problems with which they had to contend. Even as presently designed and functioning, the program is making significant gains. The Evaluation Team does, however, make the following recommendations for improvement:

1. Given the pervasiveness of the debilitating effects of financial uncertainty on the administration, staff and students in the program, on the program's capacity to modify current administrative, teaching and curricular weaknesses as indicated by the data, it is suggested that the program be guaranteed priority in funding for a three year period.
2. Appropriate incentives, particularly job security for experienced and competent personnel, should be made available to ensure a staff both sensitive to the problems of the student population and competent to take appropriate actions to remediate them.
3. Specific Teacher-Learner and Counsellor-Consellee conceptual models for the variety of student types in the program should be developed. Efforts to individualize instruction should be considered.
4. Specific materials and procedures required to implement innovative teaching procedures need to be provided. These might well begin with an inservice program which includes a preplanned lead time training period.
5. Methods of gathering, storing and sharing information must be devised or improved to guarantee both the appropriate use of such data within components of the program (e.g., guidance or teaching), and between these components.
6. Priority must be given by the administrators and supervisors of the program to make role models of counsellors and teachers more consistent with the program's goals.

7. The findings of this evaluation report should be shared among the entire staff during the lead time period or early in the fall and discussions of these findings and recommendations should be undertaken.
8. Because of the importance of testing to the instructional and counselling functions of the program, and because of the time required to operationalize these practices, appropriate clerical or paraprofessional assistance should be provided.

The Evaluation Team recognizes the idealized nature of these recommendations; we recognize the scope of change they suggest and the additional cost they imply. Given the opportunity to escape the fiscal and closely related operational problems suggested in the data, the High School Redirection Program might be replicated as a model to reclaim dropouts and potential dropouts, a model for alternative education to be applied elsewhere in New York City. As the data again and again pointed to the importance of the relationships established between students and staff, the recommendations above become a caveat for the program's continuance.

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The High School Redirection Program began in Spring 1969 and was originally housed at 475 Nostrand Avenue and 35 Arion Place. In July, 1972 the program was moved to its present location, 315 Berry Street, where it has been operating for the duration of this evaluation.

The program was designed to redirect approximately 240* potential dropouts and to assist them in developing an educational-vocational plan to continue full-time until graduation or to enter the labor market at the highest possible level. The student population for the project was drawn from dropouts and potential dropouts from high schools in Brooklyn and from Andrew Jackson in Queens. The format combined selected classes for academic credit and paid work experiences and focused on academic and occupational skills training, remedial instruction, job orientation and guidance. Pupils were to work in private industry or in municipal civil service jobs secured by the staff and were to be trained, supervised and evaluated on the job.

The major thrust of the program was to maintain the students in an educational-vocational setting while qualifying them for their high school diploma.

II. PROGRAM AND EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The proposal identified program objectives which related to progress toward the high school diploma through the acquisition of high school credits, improved attendance and classroom performance, the achievement of satisfactory work ratings and improved attitudes toward educative processes. These objectives were specified as follows:

1. It is expected that at least 80% of participating students who complete the program will make progress toward their high school diploma that will result in

*On the basis of SUE requirements which caused an increase in per capita costs, students were increased to 300, although the evaluation team was not informed of this change.

acquisition of high school credits for at least 50% of their subjects as determined by examination of High School Redirection Program records.

2. It is expected that at least 80% of the participating students who complete the program will have a statistically significant improvement of percentage of days present and statistically significant fewer incidences of tardiness than they did in their previous year of attendance at their sending schools, as determined by examination of both sending high school and High School Redirection Program attendance records.

3. It is expected that at least 80% of the participating students who complete the program will make statistically significant improvement in academic achievement as measured by a standard teacher-made final examination for each major subject. This is to be administered as a pretest at the beginning of the program and as a posttest at the end of the program.

4. It is expected that the High School Redirection Program will enable at least 80% of the participating students to obtain at least average ratings of work performance from work component supervisors. Rating forms from the New York City Department of Personnel and the Bureau of Cooperative Education are to be used for this purpose.

The Evaluation objectives designed to measure the achievement of specific program objectives identified the subjects, methods and procedures of data collection and analysis, and a suggested time schedule:

1. To determine if at least 80% of the participating students who complete the program will make progress toward their high school diploma that will result in the acquisition of high school credits for at least 50% of their subjects as determined by an examination of High School Redirection Program records.

Subjects: All students who complete the program.

Methods and Procedures: The number of courses that High School Redirection students pass and receive credit for will be compared to the number of courses taken. Where data are available, the number of courses passed by students as a result of Redirection Program participation during the 1972-1973 academic year will be compared to the number of courses passed during their previous academic year in the sending high schools. Statistically significant differences are expected.

Method of Data Analysis: Percentages, means and standard deviations of grades will be computed and reported. Where data are available, correlated t-test or an appropriate nonparametric statistical test of significance can be computed to determine if results are due to chance factors. Statistically significant differences are expected. Quantitative data will be presented in chart or table form as appropriate.

Time Schedule: Relevant data should be obtained from the sending schools during the Summer and Fall, 1972 semesters. High School Redirection Program grades should be analyzed as they become available at the end of the summer, fall and spring semesters.

2. To determine if at least 80% of the participating students who complete the program will have a statistically significant improvement of percentage of days present and statistically fewer incidences of tardiness in their last year of attendance at their sending high school, as determined by examination of both sending high school and High School Redirection Program attendance records.

Subjects: All students who complete the program.

Methods and Procedures: Records of the sending high schools and the 1972-

1973 High School Redirection Program will be examined in order to determine attendance and tardiness of students participating in the 1972-1973 Redirection Program. Average student attendance will be significantly higher, in the statistical sense, and tardiness will be significantly less than that of the same students during the last year they were in their respective sending high schools.

Method of Data Analysis: Percentages, means and standard deviations will be computed and reported. A correlated t-test or an appropriate nonparametric statistical test of significance can be computed. Quantitative data will be presented in chart or table form, as appropriate.

Time Schedule. Attendance data should be analyzed as it becomes available at the end of each attendance period, including Summer, 1972. Data from sending school records should be collected during the Summer and Fall semesters.

3. To determine if at least 80% of the participating students who complete the program will make statistically significant improvement in academic achievement as measured by a standard teacher-made final examination for each major subject. This is to be administered as a pretest at the beginning of the program and as a posttest at the end of the program.

Subjects: All students who complete the program.

Methods and Procedures: A subject-matter achievement test developed by Redirection Program Staff will be administered as a pretest at the beginning of the program and as a posttest at the end of the program in order to determine the extent of student progress during the course of the academic year. Students are expected to manifest at least 33% improvement between pretest and posttest scores. If achievement test construction is unfeasible an existing standardized

test of reading skills will be administered. Current student standardized test scores are expected to be significantly better than those obtained by the same students in the preceding academic year. Test scores will also be examined regarding the percentage of student scores below, on and above grade level.

Method of Data Analysis: Percentages, means and standard deviations will be computed and reported for grade equivalent percentiles or raw scores. A correlated t-test or an appropriate nonparametric statistical test will be computed. If sufficient previous year Metropolitan Achievement Test scores are available, group trend analysis statistical procedures could be used. Statistically significant differences are expected. Quantitative data will be presented in chart or table form, as appropriate.

Time Schedule: Pretesting should be done at the beginning of the summer, 1972 program and posttesting should be accomplished at the end of the spring, 1973 program. Posttests should be administered to those students who terminate the program in August. Pretests should be administered to those students who enter in September, 1972.

4. To determine if the High School Redirection Program has enabled at least 80% of the participating students to obtain average ratings of work performance from work component supervisors.

Subjects: All students who have jobs.

Methods and Procedures: Student work performance will be rated by work component supervisors. Rating forms from the New York City Department of Personnel and the Bureau of Cooperative Education will be used. It is expected that average student ratings on each of the characteristics will be at least 3.0

(average) on a scale ranging from 1.0 (extremely poor) to 5.0 (exceptional). Student attendance on the work component will be examined. Shop teachers and the job field coordinators will be interviewed regarding the development of student skills.

Method of Data Analysis: Percentages, means and standard deviations on the rating characteristics will be computed and reported. Quantitative data will be presented in chart or table form, as appropriate.

Time Schedule: Ratings will be reported and analyzed for the summer, fall and spring semesters.

5. To describe the scope, organization and extent of implementation of the 1972-1973 High School Redirection Program.

Subjects: All personnel and students.

Methods and Procedures: Official records and documents will be reviewed. Questionnaires will be administered to personnel and students. Interviews will be conducted with selected staff and students. Classrooms will be observed. Facilities and materials will be examined.

Method of Data Analysis: Where applicable, means and standard deviations of content analysis data resulting from interviews will be computed and reported. Statistical tests of significance will be computed, where appropriate. Qualitative and quantitative data will be presented in chart or table form, as appropriate.

Time Schedule: These procedures will be implemented throughout the course of the 1972-1973 Redirection Program.

In addition to these, the evaluation team sought to find out:

1. What suggestions students, faculty and other High School Redirection Program

staff members had for program improvement.

2. What were the student and staff attitudes toward the High School Redirection Program.

III. EVALUATION PARADIGM

In an effort to fulfill the evaluation objectives identified above, the following evaluation procedures were carried out during the time period February 16, 1973 to June 15, 1973.

1. Visits to the Site (More than 30 visits were made by the evaluation team.)
2. Collection of Data from School Records
   a. Student Achievement Records
   b. Attendance Records
   c. Guidance Records
3. Development of Questionnaires
   a. Evaluation Team
   b. High School Redirection Staff
4. Administration of Questionnaires
5. Development of Student Interviews
   a. Evaluation Team
   b. High School Redirection Staff
6. Administration of Student Interviews
7. Administration of Staff Interviews

IV. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

This section will describe and discuss data on student achievement in terms of standardized tests, teacher-made tests, courses passed, the work experience and attendance records. It should be noted at the outset that large variations in the size of the groups tested in the various subject areas resulted from the practice of scheduling individual students for courses required to graduate, from disqualification for students who entered the program after the pretesting period, from terminated students, students returned to their sending schools or graduated. (See Table I.)

TABLE I

CODE FOR TERMINATIONS
September 1972 – May 1973

Code Number	Code Item	Number of Students
1	Failure to maintain satisfactory academic and attendance record–invcluntary termination*	23
2	Returned to sending school–voluntary termination*	23
2A	Readmitted–currently enrolled*	4
3	Medical leave–unable to participate in normal school activities*	11
3A	Readmitted–currently enrolled*	4
4	Left New York City	7
5	Moved–no forwarding address, unable to locate	4
6	Joined Armed Services	5
7	Secured full-time employment; or training program*	21
8	Deceased	1
9	Severe emotional problems that prevent student from participating and unwillingness of the family to accept a referral*	19
10	Did not return subsequent to orientation*	9

TABLE I
(continued)

Code Number	Code Item	Number of Students
11	Obtained High School Equivalency Diploma	2
12	Incarcerated	3

*Visit to home by paraprofessional worker.
At least two conferences with student if available.
Attempt to confer with parents.
Case conference involving student, counsellor.
Letter to parents.

The largest sample presented is for reading, both because it is central to the program and because pretest figures from both the High School Redirection Program and sending school records allowed the construction of meaningful comparisons on the basis of the historical regression formula. Table II is a summary of pre and post program test results. Means and standard deviations were calculated. Pre and posttest data were statistically compared using correlated t-tests to ascertain if significant changes had occurred. Results were compared to evaluation objectives given in the original design.

TABLE II

SUMMARY: Pre, Predicted Post and Actual Post Program Scores in Reading for Participants in High School Redirection Program

Pre Program		Predicted Post-Program Scores*		Achieved Post-Program Scores	
Mean	6.94	Mean	7.36	Mean	8.12
Standard Deviation	2.56	*Standard Deviation	2.93	Standard Deviation	2.47
Number	214	Number	214	Number	214

t (correlated) = 8.30**
**t significant at the .01 level

*Here as in other tables, "Predicted Post Program" scores are predicted on the basis of an Historical Regression formula.

TABLE III

SUMMARY: Comparison Between Reading Growth Per Month in Sending School and High School Redirection Program for Participants in High School Redirection Program

Sending School Growth Per Month		High School Redirection Program Growth Per Month	
Mean	.05	Mean	.18
Standard Deviation	.02	Standard Deviation	.13
Number	214	Number	214

t (correlated) = 7.94**
**t significant at the .01 level

Table II is a summary of the program participants' scores at program entry, post-program results as predicted by means of the historical regression formula, and achieved or actual post program results. The population increased 1.18 years during the ten month program. The variability for the pre and post testing was almost identical (2.56 pre, and 2.47 post). A correlated comparison of the pre program scores with the post program scores resulted in a significant difference at the .01 level (t = 8.30).

The program objective that at least 80% of the program participants who completed the program would make significant improvement in their reading ability was successfully met. Further a comparison both of the predicted posttest score and achieved posttest score (see Table II) and the growth per month before and during the program (see Table III), gives evidence of the success of the reading program for the tested population.

TABLE IV

SUMMARY: Pre and Post Program Scores in Social Studies as Measured by the Board of Education's City-Wide Social Studies Examination

Pre Program Scores		Post Program Scores	
Mean	36.64	Mean	43.06
Standard Deviation	12.02	Standard Deviation	9.75
Number	95	Number	95

Social Studies growth was measured using the New York City Board of Education City-Wide Social Studies Examination. For this examination, the highest possible score is 60. Students improved an average of 6.42. Scores improved from a pre program average of 36.64 to a post program average of 43.06. The standard deviation decreased from 12.02 on the pretest to 9.75 on the posttest. Results of a correlated t-test for these data yielded a significant result at the .01 level (t = 5.21). Thus the program was successful in meeting its objective to significantly improve at least 80 per cent of the program participants completing the program in the area of Social Studies.

TABLE V

Summary: Pre, Predicted Post and Achieved Post Program Scores in Math as Measured by the California Achievement Test

Pre Program Scores		Predicted Post Program Scores		Achieved Post Program Scores	
Mean	5.84	Mean	6.04	Mean	6.51
Standard Deviation	2.57	Standard Deviation	2.47	Standard Deviation	2.39
Number	165	Number	165	Number	165

t (correlated) = 8.14**
**t significant at the .01 level

Mathematics growth was evaluated using the California Achievement Test, (1970); the results are presented in Table V. The pre program average for the High School Redirection Program population was 5.84 as compared to a 6.51 average for the post program testing. In addition, the historical regression formula was used to ascertain a predicted post program score of 6.04. Thus, the post program average was .67 greater than the pre program scores and .47 greater than the predicted post program scores. The variability of the scores as indicated by the standard deviation was consistent for the three scores obtained (see Table V).

To ascertain if the program had met the evaluation objective of assisting at least 80 per cent of the participants completing the program to significantly improve in Mathematics,

a correlatd t-test was applied to the data. The results indicated a significant difference in the pre and post test scores at the .01 level, thereby meeting the stated objective.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY: Pre and Post Scores in Science for High School Redirection Program Participants as Measured by a Teacher-Made Test

Pre Program Participation		Post Program Participation	
Mean	51.03	Mean	72.98
Standard Deviation	21.67	Standard Deviation	18.23
Number	128	Number	128

t (correlated) = 8.74**
**t significant at the .01 level

An analysis of Science scores indicated improvement of 21.95 points from pre program to post program testing (see Table V). The pre program average was 51.03 compared to a post program average of 72.98. Variability in Science ranged from a 21.67 standard deviation on the pretest to a 18.23 standard deviation on the posttest.

In order to determine if the program had met its stated objective of improving at least 80% of the students significantly in the area of Science, a correlated t-test was applied to the data. The computation resulted in a t = 8.74, a result significant in meeting its objective of improving 80 per cent of the participants significantly in the Science area.

TABLE VII

SUMMARY: Pre and Post Scores in English as Measured by the Board of Education's City-Wide English Examination

Pre Program Scores		Post Program Scores	
Mean	64.8	Mean	85.2
Standard Deviation	7.94	Standard Deviation	6.84
Number	54	Number	54

t (correlated) = 11.42**
**t significant at the .01 level

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY: Pre and Post Program Scores in English as Measured by a Teacher-Made Test

Pre Program Scores		Post Program Scores	
Mean	62.7	Mean	86.2
Standard Deviation	6.93	Standard Deviation	7.01
Number	43	Number	43

t (correlate 11.50**
**t significant the .01 level

Growth in English was measured using two examinations, the Board of Education's City-W xamination and a teacher-made test. On the City-Wide Examination, the sc .ed improvement of 20.4 points from pre program testing average to post program testing average (see Table VII). The pre program average was 64.8 compared to a post program rage of 85.2. Variability on the City-Wide English Examination ranged from a 7.94 standard deviation on the pretest to a 6.84 standard deviation on the posttest.

On the teacher-made examination in English, the pre program average was 62.7 compared to the post program average of 86.2. Variability ranged from a 6.93 standard deviation on the pretest to a 7.01 standard deviation on the posttest.

In order to determine whether the program had met its stated objective of improving at least 80% of the students significantly in English, a correlated t-test was applied to the data from both examinations. The computation resulted in a t of 11.42, a result significant at the .01 level for the City-Wide Examination, and a t of 11.50, a result significant at the .01 level for the teacher-made test. As measured by both instruments, then, the program was successful in meeting its objective of improving 80% of the participants significantly in the English area.

Data gathered to evaluate the program's efforts to improve the percentage of courses passed in the High School Redirection Program also indicated the program's success. The

results are reported in Table IX for the 1972-1973 academic year and in Table X for the 1972 Summer Session. Figures are provided to indicate the per cent of courses passed of courses taken. Means, standard deviations and a correlated t-test were derived. As the tables below indicate, the High School Redirection Program objective "To determine if at least 80% of participating students who complete the program will make progress toward their high school diploma that will result in acquisition of credits for at least 50% of their subjects . . ." was successfully met by the program. Further, by comparing the data from High School Redirection Program records to student achievement in the last year at their sending school, it became clear that a significant improvement (from 28.62% in sending schools to 78.88% in High School Redirection), in progress toward a diploma had resulted. This would suggest the larger "redirection" goal of the program was being met as well.

TABLE IX

SUMMARY: A Comparison of Percentage of Courses Passed between Sending School and High School Redirection Program for Participants in the High School Redirection Program for the Academic Year 1972-1973

Sending School, Last Year's Record		High School Redirection Program, 1972 - 1973	
Mean	28.62	Mean	78.88
Standard Deviation	25.79	Standard Deviation	30.45
Number	162	Number	162

t (correlated) = 13.59**
**t significant at the .01 level

TABLE X

SUMMARY: Percentage of Courses Passed for Participants in the High School Redirection Program, Summer 1972

Mean	84.49
Standard Deviation	25.17
Number	129

The Evaluation Design included an objective requiring data from attendance records: "To determine if at least 80% of participating students who complete the program will have a statistically significant improvement in the percentage of days present and statistically significant fewer incidences of tardiness than they did in their last year of attendance at their sending school. . . ." Tardiness data could not be retrieved from the High School Redirection Program records and was frequently missing from the records of the sending schools. Attendance data, though completed for the High School Redirection Program year, was frequently missing from sending school records. Despite requests, missing data from sending schools forced the Evaluation team to report for only 120 students during the 1972-1973 year and the 129 students from the 1972 Summer Session for whom data was complete. We believe the sample to be representative of the total population. Both because attendance data was unique for each student, based on his work assignment and date of entry, for example, and to meet the objectives as given in the Evaluation Design, percentages of days present are reported. (See Tables XI and XII.)

TABLE XI

SUMMARY: A Comparison Between Sending School Attendance and High School Redirection Attendance for Participants in the High School Redirection Program, 1972-1973 Academic Year

Sending School		High School Redirection Program	
Mean	35.38	Mean	63.53
Standard Deviation	21.25	Standard Deviation	17.42
Number	120	Number	120

t (correlated) = 10.91**

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE XII

SUMMARY: Percentage of Days Present for Participants in the High School Redirection Program, Summer, 1972.

Mean	67.87
Standard Deviation	20.04
Number	129

Based on the information available as of the date of writing this report, we can see the stated objective has been met. The High School Redirection Program's improvement in attendance of 50.26 percentage points over that in the previous sending school year is significant at 10.91, with the t significant at the .01 level.

One evaluation design objective required examination of the work study experience. The object read "To determine if the High School Redirection Program has enabled at least 80% of participating students to achieve at least average ratings of work performance from work component supervisors." Given the late date of the approval of the evaluation design and concerned that students evaluated would also be students interviewed about their work experience, grades from the Spring semester were analyzed to determine if the program objective had been met. Grades are the percentage conversions of work evaluations as provided in the New York City, Bureau of Cooperative Education's "Guide Scale for Interpretation of Rating Slips" (February, 1969). Sixty-five percent is the equivalent on that table of a 3.0 rating (average) as provided in the evaluation design.

As reported in Table XIII below, 100 percent of the students engaged in the work program received a satisfactory or better work rating. Fewer than ten percent of the students received superior ratings. Clearly, the results indicate the High School Redirection Program has met the stated objective.

TABLE XIII

SUMMARY: Work Experience Grades for Students in the High School Redirection Program

Grade	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Record
65	15	15
70	12	27
75	30	57
80	13	70
85	16	86
90	6	92
92	3	95
95	1	96
96	1	97
98	1	98
100	2	100
	Mean 77.85	
	Standard Deviation 8.8	
	Number 100	

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

As indicated in Table I, sixty-six students were terminated or left the program. We do not know the extent to which posttest scores for this group might have changed the statistical results. Neither can one conclude that they indicate the program's failure. Such numbers do, however, raise questions about entrance requirements and follow-up procedures for students leaving the program. If there were a common factor or factors, issues which cannot be resolved from data available in High School Redirection Program records, which provide insight for the program's lack of success with these students, staff time could be more effectively utilized. To what extent a more careful screening of applicants would reduce numbers in categories 1, 3, 5, 9 and 10 of Table I is not known. Project personnel are hesitant to screen out potential students, according to the project director. We therefore suggest both more careful and precise placement at entrance and more systematic follow-up procedures at termination. This activity would require increased finding.

Analysis of student achievement data points in every instance to the program's success. Students are attending with significant improvement; they are progressing towards meaningful educational goals. One hundred and twelve students have been graduated from the program since the Summer of 1972, more than 35% of them seeking acceptance to higher education while others have moved into the job market and found employment. Here again, provision for follow-up studies after graduation would allow more precise information on the program's success. On balance, the data from student achievement records is a clear call for the program's continuance.

V. INTERVIEWS AND OBSERVATIONS

The Evaluation Design required that the evaluators consider the staff and activities of the High School Redirection Program: "To describe the scope, organization and extent of implementation of the 1972-1973 High School Redirection Program." In order to implement this aspect of the proposal, a variety of activities ranging from observations to interviews were conducted between February and June 1973. The activities and findings are reported below.

All professional staff at High School Redirection were interviewed to elicit their perceptions of themselves in their positions and to elicit their perceptions of the school. Unstructured interviews were conducted with each staff member in privacy without the use of a tape recorder and with assurances of anonymity. The interviews ran in length from fifty minutes to two hours.

Specifically the interviewer sought to elicit from the staff members their perception of themselves in the professional role, their professional role preparation, their perception of students and school, their problems in meeting job expectations, the nature and quality of support from allied personnel, and their recommendations for improvement of the program. Because of scheduling problems, interviews were conducted over a period of weeks.

In addition to the interviews of staff members, a random sample of thirty students then in the program was also interviewed. A structured interview form was developed for this purpose and is found in Appendix II. In addition to the students being interviewed, 127 students who were in attendance during a two week period of time were asked to complete the interview questions under the supervision of their guidance counsellor. The results from the personal interviews and the collected data from the students who, to a lesser degree, completed the interview form are found in Table XIV.

Thus two sources of data are available: the first coming from the staff and the second

coming from the consumer of the school's programs, the student. For ease in presentation the interviews will be presented according to three main categories, counselling staff, teaching staff and administrative staff.

COUNSELLING STAFF

All three counsellors interviewed had been on the job less than one year. For each counsellor this position was his first professional position as a counsellor. All three counsellors held Bachelor's degrees, although none had formal academic training in counseling. In response to questions concerning problems that counsellors felt impinged on their effectiveness, all counsellors resented the paperwork that had to be done and their role of "policeman" regarding lateness and absences. All three viewed the school's existence as necessary but noted that an improvement in discipline was necessary.

Counsellors viewed their impact upon teaching staff as "great", "non-existent", or "they always listen to me". The supervisor of counselling was described by her staff as supportive and helpful with handling crises and providing factual information that new counsellors did not possess. There was no available direct supervision of either individual or group counselling and no in-service training program although such training was felt to be desirous. Administrative staff are in agreement that the counsellor model should be one in which the counsellor is the students' advocate. Yet counsellors felt that decisions regarding termination of students from the program and disciplinary problems were decided without counsellor input and knowledge. While both administrators and counsellors in theory felt discussions regarding termination of students or disciplinary problems needed to be made with counsellor input, in practice such a theoretical model was not in operation. Counsellors also described distant relationships with teachers with the one exception of the counsellor who was a former teacher. Counsellor solicited recommendations for improvement concerned

easing the paperwork and suggestions that some of the students with "deep-rooted" problems should not be in the school.

The supervisor of counselling seemed to understand the problems that were faced by the inexperienced counsellors. This supervisor was formerly a counsellor on the staff, has an M. A. in Vocational Counseling and considerable experience in working in programs directed toward minority youth and adults. She understood the problems the individual counsellors had in functioning on the job and felt that these could be remedied by university training and supervision. Staff turnover and personality problems were cited by the supervisor of counseling as areas of difficulty. Probably the relative lack of security in the job due to the funding cycle did not make the positions attractive to more experienced personnel. This supervisor reflected capable counselling when observed in spontaneous interactions with students. She noted there were actually two populations within the one population being served, these two populations causing diverse problems which often served to place teachers and counsellors in adversary positions. Her approach to these problems seemed realistic and persuasive. For example, the supervisor recognized the need to have a Spanish speaking female counsellor on staff but was also aware of the demand for such personnel and the limited numbers of such persons seeking positions. Supervision, given the acknowledged inexperience and lack of formal training of the counselling staff, was limited to specific factual aid in specific client-counsellor interaction. As a supervisor of counselling, this person chose to define her role in the larger and less clearly defined purpose of service to the school, service to students and counseling students. From another perspective this supervisor could not function in an advocate position for her own staff, a usual supervisory function.

EVALUATION OF COUNSELLORS AND COUNSELING SERVICE

In general this service functioned least well of the professional services observed. In the priorities established in the original program description, the counseling at High School

Redirection was to be the backbone of the unique experience offered to the student. Neither by prior academic experience, training or education was the counseling staff able to functionally implement the goal of the proposal or the expectations of administrators with the singular exception of the supervisor of counseling.

A source of difficulty is the low esteem in which counseling services are viewed by other professional staff. Whether this attitude is situation specific is not determinable. None of the counsellors reported acting as advocates of a student with other administrative staff, yet this counsellor function was explicitly described by both the program's director and assistant director as one of the counsellor's functions. Given prior considerations concerning counselling staff inexperience in formal and practical counselling knowledge it is understandable if not efficient that administrative decision regarding students are made without benefit of a counselling perspective.

There was a lack of understanding of the counselling process among the professional staff. The counsellor role as defined in the proposal and in interviews with the Director and Assistant Director is fundamentally a sound role model for counselling service. However, in practice, counsellors are expected to perform as general policemen, social workers and record keepers. It is apparent that counsellors in practice do not conform fully either to proposal standards or practical demands. The administrative staff, therefore, attempts to fill the vacancy created by counsellors' inexperience.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Consistent with the program's goals, the nature of the student population and the student perceptions identified later in this report, counselling is an essential ingredient to the program and should be modified as follows:

1. A qualified supervisor of counselling with supervisory experience is essential to the success of this program.

2. Certified experienced counsellors need to be hired.
3. in-service training programs need to be developed for support services and skill development for counsellors in individual, group and vocational counselling areas.
4. Counsellors need to be involved in case conferences with other members of the staff.
5. A three year funding cycle needs to be established to allow for staff growth and continuity of service, while attracting experienced personnel.
6. A secretary or work student needs to be employed to keep accurate records regarding lateness and absences.

TEACHING STAFF

In this section, data derived from teacher interviews, from class observations and from reviews of lesson plans, unit plans, teaching materials and teacher-made tests will be reported. The material, taken together with the student achievement data, provides a fairly clear report of the operation of the instructional program in the High School Redirection Program (see Appendix II).

All but one teacher complained about discipline within the school, and all complained about the lateness and absence of students. All teachers were able to relate successful teaching experiences as well as the frustrations of coming close to making a breakthrough with a student and then losing the student for some reason. Most of the teachers felt that textbooks were inadequate and the English teacher had specific remarks concerning rigidity of the staff to innovative ideas.

All teachers interviewed complained about the students' range of ability in terms of reading scores and a lack of positive motivation in students which they experienced as caused

by "frequent lateness and absence from class." All teachers stated it was difficult, some thought impossible, to teach cohesive units to all students because of the range in reading ability. Some had met the problem by creating groups of students with like ability within their classes while the majority of teachers acknowledged the existence of the problem, but had found no practical solutions. Most teachers said that the informal teaching situation in the High School Redirection Program had both advantages and disadvantages.

Problems in securing records and information from the referring school and the lack of support for the program in some of the sending high schools were noted by the supervisor of teachers. It was suggested that the program be affiliated with one high school so that records would not be so difficult to obtain nor record keeping such a time consuming chore.

Class observations, reviews of unit and lesson plans and an item analysis of teacher made tests designed to measure student achievement supported data derived from staff interviews.

Two kinds of teacher accommodation to the students' range of abilities often resulted though neither was a conscious adjustment based on a defensible conceptual model for the student population. First, the teacher could teach to the top of the class, neglecting the large majority of the students. Naturally problems often resulted and the teacher was forced to discipline. Such teacher behavior was interpreted as antagonism towards the students, a continuation of the prior school experience which the program hoped to modify. In these instances, ironically, the best prepared and best intentioned practitioners achieved negative results. This may well explain data derived from student interviews which suggested little change in the student's basic stance to the subject matter and reemphasis of the importance of the perceived attitude of the instructor toward the students.

The second adjustment observed, and this in groups as small as five, was an extension of the first. The teacher would select either the top student, a middle student or a poor student

for direct attention. While the student chosen did benefit from that attention, the remainder of the group became bored, even disruptive.

Lesson and unit plans created by teachers generally manifested similar weaknesses. They were planned for only one kind of student. While such plans were sometimes innovative, when observed or reviewed, the results in practice were equally poor.

It is the Evaluation Team's contention that the current "open door" admission policy, one which may well be the best possible, demands provision for the obvious differences among the student population. Here, too, is additional evidence in support of the need for revised hiring practices and regulations, for lead time for staff discussion and for close supervision and regular inservice training. In these ways, the strengths of the program, so obvious where the program succeeds, may be extended to that group of students who form the lower range of the wide standard deviation which resulted from analysis of student achievement data.

This section cannot be concluded without a few qualifying statements. It is unlikely that many schools achieve the ideal operational level implied in our observations. Neither do these comments negate the student achievement data presented earlier in the report; the program is succeeding for a significant majority of the students. Further, the success or failure of the High School Redirection Program may perhaps be more appropriately derived through comparisons with the actual prior school experience of the students in the program than with an ideal conceptual model.

On the other hand, the sense of commitment generated by the larger goals of this program among students and staff alike, may well provide the motivation necessary to actualize what is known in theory if seldom practiced on a program-wide basis.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

The following evaluation is derived from interviews with administrative staff and will address itself to specific assets and disadvantages in the program's functioning. The specific functions and roles for all administrators are derived from an unquestionable acceptance of High School Redirection as an alternate education experience based upon concern for the students, availability of staff members to the students, and a general non-blaming attitude toward the students. Generally, administrative personnel are both professionally and personally equipped to be effective in their respective roles. The range and depth of administrative commitment to the students and to the goals of the school are not likely to be found in any other agency or school within the educational network. This commitment, however, serves as both an advantage and a disadvantage to the functioning of ke Given the range of possible disadvantages which might be ascribed to any progran advantages of overcommitment are most desirable.

All administrative personnel seek to make availability to the students a top priority, and the availability of administration is greatly prized by the student population. However the availability and understanding which is provided for the students is not provided to the other personnel. Perhaps this is a good judgment on administration's part for the students, as reported in the Student Questionnaire section of this report, respond favorably to the milieu created by available administrative personnel. (See Student Questionnaire item 15.) The frequency of interaction between students and administration leads to a duplication of effort, interruption of what might be considered normal administrative functioning and further illustration of the lack of experienced counselling that has been available during the year. On the other hand, without such constant availability it is unlikely that much of the "positive feeling" about the school voiced by the students would exist.

Administrative staff tends to insist on a model for overall school functioning that is

specifically outlined in the proposal as the ideal model for staff functioning despite the reality that staff, as currently constituted, was unable to fulfill these requirements. The students are viewed from a counselling perspective, an open acceptance of students with an emphasis placed on their potential first and their actual performance second. While such a model is necessary for appropriate counselling, its application to the academic portion of the program creates confusion when planning instruction for or instructing students.

Based upon interview responses from the project director, many of these problems could be alleviated by sufficient lead time for both student and staff orientation which has not been available because of the funding cycle. Another limitation has been the fact that staff has been hired "out of necessity" or on the basis of their inclination to work with students like those found in High School Redirection rather than on the basis of prior successful experience or other indicators of potential success with a like population. While aware that staff face tremendously demanding situations that are beyond their personal and professional competence, according to the project director, there remain funding problems which render it difficult to offer or demand that staff partake of experiences that would enhance their ability. There remains a persistent fear that placing demands upon a staff member would end in the loss of that staff member when there is not a suitable replacement. While all staff morale is affected to a greater or lesser degree by a sense of fear of loss of a student or a fear of losing the school, administrative staff face the additional burden of fear of losing "potentially able staff" because of the tenuous nature of the program and changing Board of Education requirements.

At present there is considerably varied opinion among administrative staff toward changes in the school program that would maximize the program's impact. There seems divided opinion concerning the nature and problems of the population that takes advantage of this particular alternative educational experience. What interferes with a more objective

evaluation of the students' strengths and weaknesses is the aforementioned concern for students and a non-blaming attitude that views all students from their potential first and their performance second. Certain problems troubling these students are beyond the scope of competent personnel in any school situation. Other problems of an instructional nature would be better corrected or approached by a more varied remedial curriculum than the curriculum currently being offered at High School Redirection. In any case there remains the reluctance to let go of a model that seems to result in a lack of selectivity without responsibility to offer a range of programs directed at both student and staff inefficiencies. What is perhaps needed then is a model which incorporates both the advantages of the current admissions procedure with an increased concern for student achievement vis-a-vis-potential. On the other hand, to openly criticize a program whose philosophy is "every kid deserves another chance" somehow incorporated with "the buck stops here" seems unfair and overly moralistic.

STUDENT INTERVIEWS AND STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

A questionnaire to examine the feelings of students in the High School Redirection Program was developed by the Evaluation Team. (See Appendix II.) The items were used in two ways:

First, a random sample of thirty students currently enrolled in High School Redirection was selected from counsellor rosters. By choosing the sample from the counsellor's lists, care was exercised to select ten students from each of the three counsellors. The thirty students were then interviewed individually about the questions on the questionnaire and results of the interview were taken down verbatim. Second, 127 responded in writing, with varying degrees of completeness, to the questionnaire under supervision of their counsellor in a group counselling session. (See Table XIV.)

The N of 127 in column B of the table represents those students in attendance at the

group counselling sessions during the period of time in which the data was collected. The data from the direct interviews was more complete and accurate; the students' written responses were more general and less complete. Because of the nature of the student interviews and the nature of the responses made by the students in both situations, categories were developed to bring some cohesiveness to the varied and disparate responses. In Table XIV the data is separated according to interview group (n = 30) and student group (n = 127); the subtotals for each question do not always reflect the total N for the group because some students omitted responses or gave complex responses that were placed in two or more categories.

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

		N 30	N 127
1.	Average time at High School Redirection	11 Mos	10.2 Mos
2.	How found out about High School Redirection		
	friend	6	39
	High School Redirection Student	4	23
	Newspaper	0	2
	Former High School Teacher	1	41
	Other*	19	28
	*Other includes former counsellors, probation officer, sibling, assistant principal at old High School)		
3.	How High School Redirection is better than old High School		
	students	3	8
	milieu	17	63
	teachers	13	38
	counsellors	3	5
	physical plant	10	26
	work-study program	4	7
	curriculum	0	8
4.	How students perceive the way parents or guardians feel about High School Redirection		
	Positive	24	86
	Negative	1	14
	Indifferent	5	27
5.	How students perceive the way parents have recently responded		
	Positive	12	44
	Negative	12	74
	Indifferent	6	5
6.	How High School Redirection teachers are different from old High School teachers		
	teach better	1	15
	more available	18	47
	younger	5	6
	more informal	10	49
	no difference	6	12
	fewer white	0	2

	N 30	N 127
7. Most important class		
none	1	2
all	5	21
counselling	3	11
academic	15	28
practical courses*	9	19
*(reading, typing, drama)		
8. Least important class		
none	13	44
all	0	2
counselling	3	16
academic	13	43
practical	0	17
no response	1	13
9. Is classwork more difficult		
Yes	2	18
No	22	97
Same	6	12
10. Are students different		
Yes	19	71
No	11	52
11. Biggest problem in High School Redirection		
being able to read	4	13-27
being able to do math	10	41-51
financial problems	1	24-25
getting a job	9	46-55
with other students	1	5-6
with teachers	2	16-18
other*	9	44-53
*(Other includes lateness, drugs, administration, district of school, feeling teachers don't care)		
12. Biggest problem in old High School		
being able to read	2	13
being able to do math	3	23
financial problems at home	2	18
getting a job	3	29
other students	6	27
teachers	17	60
feeling teachers don't care	16	55
other*	16	35
*(Other includes lateness, absences, drugs, "too many white people")		

	N 30	N127
13. Frequency of Counsellor Contact		
2 or 3 times a week	8	12
once a week	6	3
1 or 2 times a month	1	4
when there is a need	2	14
infrequently	4	10
never	2	4
every day	6	67
several times a day	0	8
14. Criteria for selecting best teacher		
gives individual time	12	18
understands students	11	24
provokes interest in subject	2	16
explains clearly	11	11
no response	0	7
none of them	3	18
all of them	2	11
15. Criteria for admiring a staff member		
interested in me	12	21
a nice person, helping	6	19
understands	7	17
other*	2	5
none of them	7	32
all of them	2	3
*(Other includes flexibility, being head of program, "takes no risks," good teacher)		
16. Categories of wished for change		
in discipline	5	29
counselling	3	3
physical plant	10	13
better lunches	3	19
better jobs	2	12
better books	3	4
better hours in school	0	12
extra-curricular activities	10	14
add or change staff	4	16
add courses (i.e., gym)	32	25
no change	0	7
no response	0	29

	N 30	N127
17. Categories students would keep		
no change	14	43
everything but clerical practice	2	0
counselling	4	16
work-study program	1	2
trips	1	7
courses practical	8	20
courses academic	33	59
other	0	6
no response	0	37
18. Criteria for staff member least liked in which (he/she) needs improvement		
attitude toward students	14	36
non-availability	2	0
academic preparation	5	6
attitude toward job	5	4
all staff needs improvement	0	13
no response	7	42
19. Criteria of staff needing least improvement		
attitude toward students	9	13
availability	9	2
academic preparation	9	5
accepts job responsibility	6	5
all need improvement	9	16
no response	0	44
20. Category of good counsellor performance		
counsellor behavior	19	61
non-counsellor behavior	13	45
nothing	0	20
no response	0	15
21 Category of needed counsellor improvement		
counselling behavior	17	50
non-counselling behavior	7	29
no response	10	31
nothing	0	28

	N 30	N 127
22. What do you think your English teacher should be doing better?	Found to be non-revealing.	
your Math teacher?		
your Social Studies teacher?		
your Science teacher?		
your Clerical Practice teacher?		
23. Before High School Redirection what did student want to do		
nothing	3	45
finish or get back to school	15	30
get a job	13	26
join the armed services	2	1
no response	0	25
24. Before High School Redirection what were you doing		
nothing	11	50
almost dropped out	18	46
working or looking for work	2	11
no response	0	20
25. Date of graduation	Found to be non-revealing	
26. Plans after graduation		
job	5	26
college	20	65
marriage	2	2
no plans	1	16
no response	1	21

FINDINGS

Almost 50% of the students interviewed were referred to High School Redirection by a staff member of their sending high school while 33% of the questionnaire students were referred by a staff member of a sending high school. The range of possible responses included on the questionnaire and in the interview was teacher, guidance counsellor, assistant principal, and principal. In both populations interviewed, friends who knew about the program and current students in the program accounted for another 33% of the referral source.

In response to Q. 2, more than 50% of the students in both groups felt the informality of the school and the concept of a mini-school or an alternate educational experience was desirable. Second most important to the students was their perception of the teachers in the High School Redirection Program who were viewed as more available and more informal.

Parents and guardians were reported as positive about High School Redirection (Q. 3), but the students did not perceive a difference in parent/adolescent interaction (Q. 4). Teacher availability and teacher informality were viewed as the important difference between the current teachers at High School Redirection and the teachers at the sending high school. Students felt that academic subjects were more important (Q. 7) than practical skill subjects. Specific classes were singled out as being unimportant generally because of negative feelings toward the subject matter or the teacher but there was no discernible pattern to the negative statements (Q. 8). In general, classwork was found to be no more difficult in the High School Redirection Program (Q. 9), while students were felt to be different (Q. 10); both comparisons reflect the feeling of difference between High School Redirection and the former high school. The responses to Questions 9 and 10 indicate improved identification of the students with the High School Redirection environment.

Students seemed realistically concerned about "being able to read" or "being able to do math" as well as concerned about jobs (Q. 11). Students reported the major problems at

the former high school as being focused around difficulties with teachers and teacher attitudes of "not caring." Counsellors at High School Redirection were perceived as available (Q. 13), yet students were critical of counsellor performance and personality (Q. 20, Q. 21). Criteria for liking a teacher or administrator at High School Redirection were clustered among perceiving the staff member as caring, understanding, and giving of their time to the students (Q. 14). The staff members most admired were described as being interested in the students, being nice and trying to help, and being understanding (Q. 15). Students expressed negative feelings concerning personnel who were perceived as being similar to personnel at their old high school and had, as the respondents expressed it, "an attitude" (Q. 18). They spoke highly of specific personnel they felt were available and able to help (Q. 19).

Students felt the program could be improved by a better physical plant, the addition of physical education, extra-curricular activity and better lunches (Q. 16), and would maintain the program, especially the academic subjects (Q. 17).

Prior to High School Redirection most of the students had become disinterested in schooling, were already dropped out or on the verge of dropping out. At the same time, there remained within these students a desire to continue their education (Q. 23, Q. 24). Currently the students see themselves as actively engaged in making plans for continuing their education and/or working at a better job (Q. 26).

The Evaluation Team wanted to determine the reasonableness of students' stated goals, more often than not a preference to go on to college. The current requirements for entrance to the City University systems are an 8.0 reading score. Therefore, achievement of that score by graduation would seem a fair indicator of the student's likelihood to realize his goal.

To test this aspect of the program, a stratified random sample of thirty students was derived from the counsellors' lists. The range of students' scores in reading whose stated preference was to go on to college was compared with the range of scores of those students

who had stated other personal goals (e.g., work or marriage), on the questionnaires and is reported in Table XV.

TABLE XV

SUMMARY: Random Sample of Thirty Students' Records in Reading

Population	Range	Median
9 non-college bound students	5.4 – 10.3	7.7
21 college bound students	7.0 – 13.6	8.1

Table XVI is a presentation of the reading scores by grade level:

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY: Stratified Random Sample of Reading Scores by Grade Level

Number	Grade Level	Reading Score Range	Median
10	Seniors	6.7 – 13.6	9.4
12	Juniors	3.2 – 10.3	7.1
2	Sophomores	8.1 – 8.1	8.1
6	Non-Graded	7.0 – 8.7	7.9

The results indicated that, given current entrance requirements, those students expressing a desire to go on to college would likely be able to do so. Only one senior who hoped for a college career fell below the 8.0 point. Four juniors were below the 8.0 level. Given the success of the reading program already identified in Tables II and III, it is conceivable that similar or better success will apply for juniors and sophomores in the program as well.

Thus, the Evaluation Team was able to conclude that the educational and vocational aspirations of the students were reasonable in the light of the reading requirements. It was not possible to know the extent to which the counselling or teaching staff of the program was responsible for this fact.

The High School Redirection Program, as a school, and significant members of the staff

in particular seem to have had a pronounced effect and impact on the lives of a majority of the students interviewed. An attitude of caring, the feeling of being understood and the feeling for an availability of staff with an informal manner are perceived as crucial differences between High School Redirection and former high schools. These differences appear to have the greatest impact upon the students' perception of their educational opportunity. The students' responses indicate that they are realistically critical of and sensitive to staff members they perceived as representing uncaring judgmental attitudes toward them or who exercise authority in an arbitrary manner.

Course content seems, in general, to be inconsequential to feelings of trust, caring and availability and yet the students were able to selectively criticize course content. Caring and available staff members, who also might have ability and experience, seem to serve as "appropriate and effective role models" for the students and therefore are empowered to affect the students' lives. Despite being disenchanted with their academic experience in their sending high schools, their desire to continue formal education suggests a possible criterion for entrance to and may partially explain the success of the program.

VI. APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Norm-Referenced Standardized Test Results

In the table below, please enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives.

45A. If there was only one testing period report the mean scores (grade equivalent) in the column "actual posttest." Attach additional sheets if necessary. Before completing this question, read all footnotes.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	Test Used (MAT, CAT etc.)	Form	Level	Total N 1/	2/ Group ID	Sample 3/ Size	Sample 3/ YN	Pretest Date	Pretest 4/ Mean	5/ Predicted Posttest Mean 4/	Actual Posttest 4/ Mean	Actual Posttest Date	Statistical Data 6/ 7/ df	Test Used	Test Used Obtained Value 8/	Level of Significance Obtained (None; p=.05;.01 .05	None	.01	.05
			CAT(reading)			214	Grade 12		x	10/72	6.94	7.36	8.12	5/73	213	t	8.30			x	
			CAT(math)			165	Grade 12		x	10/72	5.84	6.04	6.51	5/73	164	t	8.14			x	
			Science (teacher-made)			128	Grade 12		x	10/72	51.03	-	72.98	5/73	127	t	8.74			x	
			Social Studies (city-wide)			95	Grade 11		x	10/72	36.64	-	43.06	5/73	94	t	5.21			x	
			English (teacher-made)			42	Grade 3		x	10/72	62.67	-	86.20	5/73	42	t	11.50			x	
			English (city-wide)			54	Grade 4		x	10/72	64.8		85.2	5/73	53	t	11.42			x	

1/ Total N (total number). Indicate the total number of participants in the component.
2/ Group I.D. (group identification) Indicate group, e.g. grade 5; grade 3 control; grade 3 treatment (a control group consists of students selected at the same time that treatment participants were selected and who essentially have the same characteristics as the treatment group. The control group does not take part in the compensatory activity, whereas the treatment group does.)
3/ Y/N (yes/no) Is sample representative of universe? Check Y (yes) or N (no).
4/ Mean. Use grade equivalents unless unavailable from publisher's norms. Specify type of mean used.
5/ Predicted posttest. Use only for correlated samples using "historical" regression procedure.
6/ Statistical data. Use test of significance for actual posttest v. predicted posttest where correlated samples are used.
7/ d.f. (degrees of freedom). Indicate degrees of freedom used in analysis.
8/ Test used and value (e.g., t=3.85, F=4.17, etc.) Scores for the same individuals should be included in pre and posttest calculations.

APPENDIX II

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1) How long have you been at High School Redirection?

2) How did you find out about High School Redirection?

   a) a friend
   b) a student in the program
   c) newspaper
   d) former high school teacher
   e) other

3) In what ways, if any, is High School Redirection different from your old High School?

4) How do your parents (or guardians) feel about High School Redirection?

5) Have your parents treated you differently since you've been at High School Redirection?

6) In what ways, if any, are the teachers here different from your old High School teachers?

7) What is the most important class you are taking now? Why?

8) What is the least important class you are taking now? Why?

9) Is classwork more difficult in High School Redirection than in your old High School?

10) Are the students (here, in High School Redirection) different from the students in your old High School? (If yes, how?)

11) What is your biggest problem in High School Redirection? (Check 3)

a) being able to read
b) being able to do math
c) financial problems at home
d) getting a job
e) problems with other students
f) problems with the teachers
g) feeling that teachers didn't care
h) other

12) What was your biggest problem in your old High School? (Check 3)

a) being able to read
b) being able to do math
c) financial problems at home
d) getting a job
e) problems with other students
f) problems with the teachers
g) feeling that teachers didn't care
h) other

13) How often do you see your Counsellor?

14) Who is the best teacher you have here at High School Redirection? (Tell why he or she is the best.)

15) Of all the people on the staff, whom do you admire? Why is that?

16) If you were in charge of High School Redirection what changes would you make?

a)
b)
c)

17) If you were in charge of High School Redirection what programs, classes or events would you keep?

a)
b)
c)

18) Who on the staff needs the most improvement as you see it? Why?

19) Who on the staff needs the least improvement as you see it? Why?

20) What does your Counselor do well?

21) What could your Counselor do better?

22) What do you think

your English teacher should be doing better?

your Math teacher should be doing better?

your Social Studies teacher should be doing better?

your Science teacher should be doing better?

your Clerical Practice teacher should be doing better?

23) Before you came to High School Redirection what did you want to do?

24) Before you came to High School Redirection what were you doing?

25) When will you graduate?

26) What will you do after you graduate?

APPENDIX III

SCIENCE

Biology Evaluation

Fall, 1972

True or False 20 points

1. One usually gets venereal diseasethrough sexual contact with an infected person.
2. Syphillis and gonorrhea are two kinds of venereal disease.
3. Venereal Disease is usually cured by forgetting about it.
4. Untreated syphillis can cause blindness and heart attack.
5. Sickle cell anemia affects mostly black people.
6. Sickle cell anemia is a hereditary blood disease.
7. There is no cure for sickle cell anemia.
8. Trichinosis is a disease one gets from eating improperly cooked infected pork.
9. Uterine cancer affects only women.
10. The heart has 3 chambers

Multiple Choice 20 points

11. The human female releases an egg every 28 days. This process is called
a) menstruation b) eviction c) masturbation
12. Which is not a part of the female reproductive system?
a) ovary b) uterus c) testes
13. The human fetus develops in the a) uterus b) placenta c) vagina
14. The union between the egg and the sperm is called
a) maturation b) fertilization c) implantation
15. The fetus is fed through the a) umbilical cord b) nose c) mouth
16. Genetic material is called a) chromosomes b) sperm cell c) fetus
17. Human beings have a) 23 chromosomes b) 92 c) 46 chromosomes
18. The sperm lives for approximately a) 3 days b) 1 day c) 6 days

19. The testes produce cells called a) sperm b) eggs c) chromosomes

20. The chromosomes of the human male are a) xx b) xy c) xxy

Underline the correctly spelled word

21.	Biology	Biogy	Beology
22.	Contagious	Contageous	Contangous
23.	Dominant	Dominent	Dormeant
24.	hybrid	hibryd	hebrid
25.	Imunity	immunity	emmunity
26.	Vacine	vacene	Vaccine
27.	Deficiency	Defeciency	Dificiency
28.	alergy	alerge	Allergy
29.	epidemic	ipedemic	epedemic
30.	communicable	cammunicible	communecable

Fill in the Blanks

31. The study of inter-relationship between living things and their environment is called _____.

32. If you can no longer get a disease you are said to be _____ to that disease.

33. Another expression for spontaneous generation is _____.

34. The constant competition between organisms for the necessities of survival is called _____.

35. Hormones are produced by _____ - _____.

36. The chemical messengers of the body are _____.

37. The process by which green plants manufacture food is called _____.

38. Red blood cells are produced in the _____.

39. Cells of the nervous system are called _____.

40. Treatment of a disease by using small needles inserted under the skin is called _____.

Write a complete sentence to answer the following 20 Points

41. What is a balanced diet?

42. Why are the white blood cells called the Soldiers of the Body?

43. Who is a hemophiliac?

44. What causes mongoloid babies?

45. Who is a schizophrenic?

46. What are hallucinations?

47. What does paranoid mean?

48. What does one mean by psychological dependence?

49. What does one mean by blood type?

50. What is your blood type?

High School Redirection

English Examination

Name _____

Date _____

Spelling

Put in ie or ei

bel ve

rec ve

f nd

fr nd

y l

c ling

for gn

h r

r ns

n ce

r gn

handkerch f

conc ted

th r

th f

w rd

l sure

fr ght

h ght

Correct Usage

Their – There – They're

Put the correct word in the blank

1. For dinner, _____ having steak and potatoes.
2. Let's move the table over _____.
3. _____ is no comparison!
4. We're going to _____ house for dinner.
5. If _____ late, we'll miss the train.
6. _____ car was stolen last night.

Two – Two – Too

Put the correct word in the blank

1. It's _____ hot to play baseball.
2. Only _____ boys showed up for practice.
3. Jim wants to play, _____.
4. I'm going _____ my aunt's.
5. There are _____ many people in this class.
6. Return the book _____ the office.

Agreement of Subject and Verb

Underline the correct verb

1. Boys and girls together (makes, make) education fun.
2. Eddie (plays, play) chess every morning.
3. The pack of cards (is, are) missing from the shelf.
4. Here (come, comes) the mailman.
5. There (is, are) three parts in this play.
6. Betty and Joe both (sings, sing) very well.
7. The baby (needs, need) to be fed.
8. I (like, likes) summer if it's not too hot.
9. Neither Alice nor Frank (are, is) going to work any more.
10. Over two hundred separate homes (makes, make) up your body.

Suffixes and Plurals

Add the ending called for and make the necessary changes

Add ness

lovely
shy
sure
cleanly
lazy
homely

Add ing

hope
hop
singe
occur
begin
worry
wrap
pin
travel
counsel
hurry
propel
leap
fatten
permit

Add ous

continue
courage
advantage
fame
mischief
mystery

Add or, er, ar

audit
outfit
supervisor
beg
distribute

Add ment

judge
announce
arrange
acknowledge

Give the plural

radio
piano
city
alley
loaf
louse
fly
self
miss
scissors
commander-in-chief
ally
country
chief
ox
news
tooth
handful
moose
house
goose
dye

Vocabulary

Circle the word not related to the other words in each group.

1. liberated
freed
release
emancipated
manacled

2. solitude
resolution
aloneness
isolation
seclusion

3. careful
alert
wary
upstart

4. biased
   underprivileged
   prejudiced
   unfair

5. abridged
   incomplete
   uncut
   shortened

6. released
   shackled
   restrained
   confined

7. withdrawn
   unresponsive
   underdeveloped
   unsociable

8. output
   yield
   surrender
   product

9. luck
   foresight
   prudence
   forethought

10. misgiving
    blunder
    foreboding
    presentiment

Circle the word that has most nearly the same meaning as the underlined word.

1. augmented work for me
   smaller
   trained
   unskilled
   enlarged

2. urban affairs
   national
   rural
   community
   municipal

3. duplicating machine
   folding
   adding
   copying
   enlarging

4. nomadic life
   native
   permanent
   mutinous
   roving

5. chronic truant
   defiant
   potential
   habitual
   undisciplined

6. questionable allegiance
   disloyalty
   sedition
   honesty
   fidelity

Writing (Choose A or B)

A Below are seventeen song titles. Choose at least ten of them, and write a letter, a story, or newspaper article, weaving them together. (100-150 words)

1. If Loving You is Wrong, I Don't Want to be Right
2. Honky Tonk
3. We've Come too Far to End it Now
4. Help
5. Soul Man
6. Lookin' Through the Window
7. Lean on Me
8. I Wanna Be Where You Are
9. Where is the Love
10. Too Late to Turn Back Now
11. Rip Off
12. Jealous
13. Outa-Space
14. People Make the World Go Round
15. Reverend Lee
16. I'm Black and I'm Proud
17. Tell Me This is a Dream

B — Select one of these topics (or pick one of your own) and write 100-150 words.

1. Astrology — To Believe or Not Believe
2. The Job I Want
3. View on Women's Lib
4. The Distribution of Wealth in the United States–Is It Fair?
5. How Much Money Do I Need to be Happy?
6. One of My Earliest Memories

APPENDIX IV

High School Redirection – Remedial Reading Program

Aims: The remedial reading program has been designed to cater to the needs of the individual student, to enhance motivation, and to relieve feelings of competitiveness. The students are permitted to work at their own speed, to complete exercises geared to their own ability, and to work with materials which encourage individual initiative.

Format: Ability groupings. Each student, based on the result of the California Reading Test, whose grade level is one or more years below his present grade placement is scheduled for two periods of reading instruction each day. After this initial placement the students are given an individual diagnostic test (Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales) to further determine whether or not the student is in need of remediation, and also to ascertain the severity of the problems.

The responsibilities of the reading program are shared by one paraprofessional whose duties are to reinforce those skills which are taught during the first period of reading instruction. Reading classes are divided in the following manner:

Group I – (period 1) grade levels up to 4.0
Group II
& Group IV – (period 2 & 4) grade levels 5.5 –
Group V – (period 5) 4.0 – 5.5
Group III – (period 3) Students whose language difficulties are the main deterrent to reading progress
Group VI – Diagnostic Testing

Materials:

Individualized Reading Program (Grolier)
Reading Attainment System I – up to level 4.0
II – from 4.0 – 6.5
Globe Classroom Library
Tactico (Set I)
Be a Better Reader Series (Smith)
Remedial Reading Drills
Action (Entire Unit)
Scope Magazine)
Trackdown) Scholastic
Across & Down)
Picto-cabulary Series

Administering the Program: (the following procedure has been followed)

a. an orientation session plan
b. scheduling
c. student placement
d. choosing selections
e. using skill cards
f. recordkeeping
g. evaluating student attainments
h. advancing the student
i. expanding the program
j. incorporating other materials

Class: Reading Lab
Instructor:

I. Topic

A. Phonics
B. Reading Comprehension
C. Study Skills

II. Goals and Skills

A. Word recognition through phonics for better reading skills
B. Developing comprehension proficiency
C. Improving study skills for more efficient learning of any subject

III. Estimated Time

Varies with individual student

IV. Materials – New Century Curriculum

A. Codebuster and/or Spellbinder
B. Read Achieved
C. Study Skillsbuilder
D. Workbooks, answer sheets, access markers
E. Cassettes
F. Audio-frame

UNIT PLAN

Subject – English

Topic: A unit centering on the theme – "The Job I Want"

Goals: To help each student think about work in general and about the specific job or career he'd like
To help him distinguish between "a job to get over" and a career he might strive for and enjoy
To help him know where to find out more about his interests, the training required, etc.
To emphasize some of the specific skills necessary in getting a job
To enable students with work experience to share their perceptions

Skills: Reading and discussing a story
Writing a letter of application
Researching a job

Estimated Time: One week

Preferred Class Period: 5th or 6th

UNIT PLAN

Subject – Social Studies

Topic – Latin American Countries

Aim: To give a brief geographical outline of the countries in South America
This unit will be over a period of 10 days

Description: In this topic I will be involved with the following countries:

1) Argentina
2) Brazil
3) Ecuador
4) Colombia
5) Chile
6) Paraguay
7) Peru
8) Uruguay
9) Venezuela
10) Bolivia

The following information will be discussed:

A – Climate
B – Natural Resources
C – Different types of people
  1. Educational System
  2. Different types of government

Evaluation: Give a written evaluation, a multiple choice type test.
Also a map review of these countries will be given.